

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Bill # SB 46 2nd SUB Date March 10, 2009**Short Title School Property Tax Equalization Amendments**Contact Cathy DudleyTitle MSP Budget and Property Tax SpecialistAgency Utah State Office of EducationPhone 801.538.7667**Short Form**

Use only when there is no appropriation needed for state agencies, and no fiscal impact on state revenues, local governments, businesses, or individuals.

If the bill looks like it should have a fiscal note, explain why it does not. For example, a bill might put into code something that is already current practice.

Attachments welcome.

- ☐ State agencies will not require an appropriation to implement the bill.
☐ There is no fiscal impact on local governments.
☒ There is no fiscal impact on businesses
☒ There is no fiscal impact on individuals.
☒ The bill will not affect revenues.

Explain why this bill has no fiscal impact.

The implementation of this second substitute may be handled with existing personnel.

A. What parts of the bill cause fiscal impact?

Cite specific sections or line numbers.

B. Which program gets the appropriation?

(Approp. Unit Code)

(To appropriate to an additional program use an additional form.) This is ____ of ____.

C. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Assume that a legislator calls you in to explain how you came up with your fiscal impact and these are the only notes you get to take with you.

List all costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

This second substitute eliminates the requirement for "receiving" school districts to conduct a public hearing at which the "receiving" school district adopts a budget for the expenditure of the capital outlay increment monies.

Not only is a school district required to separately budget and account for the capital outlay increment monies, but this second substitute requires those school districts to submit copies of an audit on the use of those capital outlay increment monies and to submit copies of that audit to the county treasurer, the State Office of Education (USOE), and the superintendents of each of the contributing school districts within the "receiving" school district's county.

USOE is then required to determine if a "receiving" school district spent the funds appropriately. If so, the "receiving" school district shall return their share of the capital outlay increment monies to the county treasurer and the county treasurer shall redistribute those funds.

Implementation of this bill will require USOE to increase their workload using existing personnel.

Fiscal Impact Tables

Current Budget Year
FY 2009

Coming Budget Year
FY 2010

Future Budget Year
FY 2011

D. If this is a revenue bill, show impacts here. (Select funds from drop-down menu.)

Total	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

E. Show Costs to Implement the Bill by Fund (Select funds from drop-down menu.)

Total	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

F. Show Costs to Implement the Bill by Expense Category.

Personal Services			
Travel			
Current Expense			
DP Current Expense			
DP Capital Outlay			
Capital Outlay			
Other/Pass Thru			
Total	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

G. How will the bill impact local governments?

Your estimate of the bill's impact
on local governments.

Attachments welcome.

"Receiving" school districts would have to higher auditors to audit the accounting for the capital outlay increment monies, which may increase the school districts' audit costs.

H. How will the bill impact businesses?

Your estimate of the bill's impact
on businesses.

Attachments welcome.

N/A

I. How will the bill impact individuals?

Your estimate of the bill's impact
on individuals.

Attachments welcome.

N/A

FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN A FIRST CLASS COUNTY							
FY2009-2010 - USING CURRENT DATA							
District	3 Year Average	First Class County School Districts' October 1, 2008 Enrollment¹	COUNTY CLASS	TAX REVENUE GENERATED BY IMPOSED TAX RATE OF:	TOTAL DISTRIBUTED @ 25% THREE YEAR AVERAGE GROWTH	TOTAL DISTRIBUTED @ 75% BASED ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS' FALL ENROLLMENT TO THE TOTAL	Increase/decrease of 0.0006 tax rate revenue from a school district
	Growth Increase			0.0006	\$11,475,625	\$34,426,876	
	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1 Alpine			2				
2 Beaver			4				
3 Box Elder			3				
4 Cache			3				
5 Carbon			4				
6 Daggett			6				
7 Davis			2				
8 Duchesne			4				
9 Emery			5				
10 Garfield			5				
11 Grand			5				
12 Granite	-	68,403	1	\$14,467,804	\$0	\$16,085,833	\$1,618,029
13 Iron			3				
14 Jordan	1,490.0	47,857	1	\$10,789,876	\$11,475,625	11,254,181	11,939,930
15 Juab			5				
16 Kane			5				
17 Millard			4				
18 Morgan			5				
19 Nebo			2				
20 No. Sanpete			4				
21 No. Summit			3				
22 Park City			3				
23 Piute			6				
24 Rich			6				
25 San Juan			4				
26 Sevier			4				
27 So. Sanpete			4				
28 So. Summit			3				
29 Tintic			5				
30 Tooele			3				
31 Uintah			4				
32 Wasatch			4				
33 Washington			2				
34 Wayne			6				
35 Weber			2				
36 Salt Lake	-	23,678	1	\$11,168,542	\$0	5,568,182	(5,600,360)
37 Ogden			2				
38 Provo			2				
39 Logan			3				
40 Murray	-	6,458	1	\$1,999,903	\$0	1,518,681	(481,222)
42 Canyons		33,160	1	\$7,476,378	\$0	7,797,995	321,617
Unallocated							